

San Diego's First Bishop

MOST REV. JOHN J. CANTWELL, D.D.

*Sermon preached at the installation of the Most Rev. Charles F. Buddy as first Bishop of the new Diocese of San Diego, Calif.
Reprinted from the Tidings (Los Angeles), in the
issue of February 5, 1937.*

THE first bishop of the two Californias—Upper and Lower—in the year 1840 entered upon a ravished and a lonely inheritance. The missions, once a riot of beauty, had lost all their loveliness. Those bells whose voices once sped men's minds across the ages to Bethlehem, to Nazareth, and to Calvary, were silent. The Indians had been forced back to the wilds. Politicians laid greedy hands on the patrimony of the poor. The abomination of desolation stood in the holy place. Fra Junipero Serra these many years was sleeping his last sleep anigh the Mountain of the King in his own well loved Carmel. He and the men of God who followed him had come to California to fulfil a high vocation.

A CHAIR OF TEACHING

As a venerable successor of the Fisherman sent Augustine to England, Patrick to Ireland, Boniface to Germany, Cyril and Methodius to the Slavs, so came the first missionaries to our land. If challenged as to why they did the things they did they would have answered that they had come "by the Grace of God and the Favor of the Apostolic See." That same authority, in the Papal document read here this morning, sends to you a bishop of your own. He sets up his chair of teaching in this venerable city, and from it will rule the flock of Christ. He comes with the oil of consecration glistening upon him even as the oil was poured forth upon Aaron and ran down to the hem of his garments. Happily, he is in the fulness of his manhood, ripe in experience, a priest, prudent and faithful, whose unselfish labors have rejoiced the Church of God. When Bishop Garcia Diego y Moreno established his Episcopal See besides San Diego's silver strand, he found here a pueblo of 150 souls. He moved his residence to the more promising and more firmly established city on the Santa Barbara Channel. There he lived, and there his mortal remains rest until this day before the High Altar in the Mission Church.

ERECTION OF DIOCESE

The erection of this Diocese of San Diego as a Suffragan See of Los Angeles is a testimony to the devoted zeal of the priests and people of the new Diocese. It is the witness of the Sovereign Pontiff to the importance of this community, to its advancement in education, in art, and the cultural amenities of civilization. Your hearts rejoice when you see this city of your love accorded an important ecclesiastical distinction. The induction of a bishop into the See of San Diego is the fulfilment of anxious hopes, the dawn of a new day, and the promise of a glorious future. You may well say: "The winter is now past, the rain is over and gone, the flowers have appeared in our land. . . . The fig tree hath put forth her green figs; the vine and flower yield their sweet smell." The harvest is yours to sow and yours to reap. May God grant that the glorious vision that once passed over this land will be seen again.

A PRIMARY DUTY

Your bishop comes to be a teacher and a leader. His mission, like that of the early Franciscans, is for the salvation of souls. He comes ready, also, to play a man's part in the social and civic betterment of this community and in every activity that will make for a greater and better San Diego. Primarily, it will be his duty to direct and to oversee the building of a great superstructure on the foundations that these many years have been laid in the blood and tears and sweat of devoted men and women. He will recall spiritual traditions that lie dormant, and restore to those who have forgotten a belief in that God who for generations has stabilized our government and made the United States of America the envy of the nations.

REVERENCE OF GOD

While we pay a well merited meed of praise to the intelligent and heroic work of the Jesuit and Franciscan Fathers in the great Southwest, it is well to remember that the descendants of the Cavaliers, Presbyterians, Quakers, Baptists, Lutherans, and the Wesleyans, emulated one another in a desire to have their children instructed in the Commandments of God and in their father's faith. Generously they built and supported churches and schools. The govern-

ment of the day, too, went far in giving encouragement to every religious endeavor, and its approval to every worthwhile moral development. Despite the pioneer's fierce struggle with nature, despite the mighty task of subduing a continent, despite besetting temptations to luxury and forgetfulness, he cherished a deep reverence for the God of his fathers. He gathered with his family in church and chapel and conventicle to renew his trust in Him and to teach his children to love Him who led their fathers out of bondage into a land flowing with milk and honey.

VANISHING SENSE OF RELIGION

That old sense of religion, unhappily, is nearly gone. The change is more marked in one place than another; but the general truth that men are unmindful of their dependence upon Almighty God is, I think, self-evident. You may ask what is the cause of this forgetfulness of religious principles, this popular admiration of theories foreign to American thought, practice, and tradition.

Christianity, you know, is a religion that must be learned. The first mission given to the Apostles was that they should teach. The faith that they preached is the basis of all righteousness. The faith is a virtue not of the will but of the intellect. Hence, St. Paul says: "How can they believe unless they hear, and how can they hear without a preacher, and how can he preach unless he be sent?" So, unless the Christian religion be taught some way or another it degenerates and finally disappears. And religion, alas, these many years has not been taught to the rising generation of youth. The American family is so occupied with toil that there is little opportunity and less energy left for religious instruction.

CHANGING CONDITIONS

The children, growing up are subject to changing conditions in the home so that if they are to know any subject, secular or religious, they must learn that subject outside the family circle. Our schools, indeed, take care of the secular training. You realize, on the other hand, the sad story of the churches, and the incessant cry that comes from all over the land of empty pews and of the indifference of American parents and of American youth to religious teaching. Even our own Catholic people, in their search for pleasure, in

their pursuit of a good time, crowd the early Masses in our churches. And they, too, unless they read and study, shall forget the principles handed down to them from their fathers.

THE PRESENT UNREST

This absence of a practical belief in the existence of God and of man's accountability to Him is largely responsible for the unrest that is in the world today. St. Augustine, a long time ago, wrote:

Thou, O Lord, hast made us for Thyself, and our hearts shall never be at rest until they rest in Thee. Thou, God, in the beginning didst make Thy people for Thy service, and they shall never know content until they acknowledge the World's Hope and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent, who is the Expectation of the Ages.

It is not necessary for us to look to Europe for signs of discontent. Doubt and suspicion fill the atmosphere at home. One political party has fallen a victim to the social disturbance. Men, like the foolish seekers after buried treasure in the ruins of the Old Missions, are digging and prying at the very foundation stones of organized government.

FOLLOWING PIED PIPERS

They are heedless of the general ruin in the pursuit of pet economic theories. They follow every Pied Piper that lures them with any kind of cure-alls. The attack of the materialist is made on every possible point. In the social order the rights of fatherhood and of personal freedom are denied. Parents delegate their natural rights to others, and rest content with being "pals" or "big sisters" to children that are theirs to raise for God and country. The rights of property are laughed at. The right to have a noble ambition in life is condemned. In the moral order free love and eugenics are destroying our American conception of marriage.

RELIGION TRAVESTIED

In the intellectual order God is denied, or a least ignored. Religion is not considered in education. The philosophy that looks beyond the sense to a world that lives above matter is travestied as a fraud. Human life is held at such little worth that its disregard has made the highways a peril. Suppression of crime is now taxing the ingenuity and every

resource of our police departments. A world, once religious and God-fearing, with complacency looks on while religion is travestied, while sanctuaries are destroyed, while men of God are slain, while consecrated virgins are defiled, and while brother slays brother. This new materialistic state, drunk with its new found power, would not only destroy religion but by every means at its disposal banish the very idea and thought of God from human minds and deface His image stamped on human souls. The Commandments given to Moses are no longer a curb on human selfishness, human passion, and human greed.

OUR BITTEREST FOE

Religion, rightly understood, is not something to be believed only, but something to be lived. "Faith," said the great Apostle, "without good works is dead." The enemy of that living faith in the supernatural is in our day Communism. Communism—the abortion of materialism—is an economic theory; but it is more. It is the bitterest foe of organized religion, of Christianity, and of the finest American traditions. It completely sacrifices the individual on the altar of the community. Years ago there was great rejoicing when a new flag floated over the Winter Palace of the Czar. An expectant world looked to the Soviets to build up a freer political and more equitable economic system and thus make Russia nearer to be the land of the heart's desire. The tragedy of Russia is a lesson for us all. It is a far cry from California to Russia but the philosophy that inspired Bolshevism, like the philosophy that inspired the French Revolution, will influence the course of history.

France failed to realize its full desire of liberty, equality, and fraternity. It, nevertheless, in the nineteenth century popularized democratic government. The Russian Revolution, too, will influence the course of history in the twentieth century. The former brought to the forefront the political problem:—the Russian Revolution emphasizes the economic. No government in our day can afford to ignore it or dare to return to the old policy of *laissez faire*.

PROGRESS WE MUST

Progress we must. Let us avoid the pitfalls that are in our path. There is on the one hand the problem of curtailing individualism so as to prevent for all time the ex-

plotation of the worker and of the poor. On the other, there is the no less important problem of retaining personal liberty, without which life is not worth living. The Popes these many years have pointed out the solution of the world's problems but their voices for generations have been as men crying in the wilderness. While we, as Catholics, are critics of Communism and of its social theories, it cannot be alleged that the Church is against the interests of the workers and in favor of the *status quo* or that easy policy of leaving well enough alone. No student of history will deny that the Church has been the strongest champion of the well-being of the worker.

MISSION OF THE CHURCH

There is no body on earth that has so persistently insisted on the inalienable rights of every human being than the great Church of Christ. Founded by Jesus Christ, the reputed Son of Joseph, a carpenter, the Church of God is neither Jew nor Gentile, master nor slave, rich nor poor. Oh, how the workers have cause to bless the memory of Leo XIII and Pius XI! The "Rerum Novarum" of the former and the "Quadragesimo Anno" of the latter are by their kindly humanism and wise principles in striking contrast with the hard, the bitter, and inhuman teaching of the "Communist Manifesto" of the German materialists, Marx and Engels.

Nevertheless, the mission of the Church, as it has been presented to you in the past, and as it will be represented to you in your new bishop, is neither political nor economic. Just as the Church can live in a monarchy, or a republic, or an aristocracy, so can she live and prosper under any economic system that does not violate the rights of justice. The Church is in this world but is not of this world. To think so would be to harbor a delusion as carnal as that of the Jews who desiderated a Messiah to restore the ancient splendors of Zion.

HER SUCCESS

The Church was not founded to solve unemployment or to regulate the currency crisis any more than she exists to achieve success in literature, in art, or drama, or music. Her ethical teaching, her rich and varied life, will find expression in ways economic and artistic. She exists to

bring to the world that peace of Christ which surpasses all understanding. Her real successes are regarded not in the wealth of nations but in the sanctification and salvation of souls for whom Christ died.

O that some one had a voice so strong that it could be heard by the multitudes—a voice with a power that would turn men's minds from the ephemeral trifles of politics and business and pleasure to Christ, even as Elias spoke of old:

Hear all ye heavens and hear all ye earth, for the Lord has spoken. I have brought up children and have exalted them, and they have despised me. The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master, but Israel has not known me and my people have not understood.

A NEW LEADER

You, my dear friends, Catholic and Protestant, have a share in molding public opinion unto better things. You have a part in guiding the destiny of our nation. Today a new leader has risen up among you. You must sustain his arms even as his companions lifted up the arms of Moses while the Israelites fought in the plains below. You of the laity can help to bring back a forgotten God to His own people. You can be exemplars of high thinking and of noble living. The task is yours, men and women. We priests, like the Levites of old, are not numbered among the tribes of Israel. Our work is done apart. They will listen to you when they will not listen to us.

THE CROZIER OF ST. DIDACUS

Most Reverend and dear Bishop, today for the first time you grasp the crozier of St. Didacus. May it be a support to you unto many years and happy days. Men of God—some veterans in the Army of Christ—have pledged to you their reverence and their obedience. They will not fail you. A devoted laity will bind you to their hearts and homes with strands of affection. Priests and people will march with you unto difficult tasks as they have done with the unworthy one who has preceded you. They will help you to strengthen the stakes of the holy place and to extend its curtains. To you—their Father and leader—they shall look for advice and guidance and correction. He who called you from out the workshop of the carpenter, Joseph, to be His witness in broader fields will not be wanting to you. He will sustain you in the Eternal Arms and

the Light of His Spirit will guide your feet; and His servant, San Diego, whose name is upon this city and is the property of this Diocese, will be to you a tower of strength and a fount of consolation now, in death, and in the Day of Account.

In Defense of the Individual

REV. EDWARD ROBERTS MOORE

*Speech delivered at the Graduation Exercises of Morris High School,
New York, N. Y., January 27, 1937.*

IT is a curious paradox that a man is most individualistic when he is young, yet that youth is most readily regimented to its own destruction. It is a paradox of modern life that the State, whose only reason for existence is the good of the individual, today all too often thinks of the individual solely in terms of its own good. It is an ironic and anomalous paradox of an age which deifies freedom that there should be left in many parts of the world no such thing as freedom. Marching hordes with flying banners of vivid hue or strange design do not mean freedom. Try just once to turn and march against that tide or to throw down one of the banners and you will know that what I say is true. Hurling defiance at constituted authority is not freedom, and the history of the world has shown that in the wake of the violent overthrow of constituted authority often comes a far worse tyranny than existed before. There is not much to choose between the dictator and the proletariat as a master. And the economic slavery of a democracy is not necessarily less cruel than political despotism.

Fifty-five years ago Leo XIII condemned economic slavery. "All agree," he said, "and there can be no question whatever, that some remedy must be found, and quickly found, for the misery and wretchedness which press so heavily at this moment on the large majority of the very poor. . . . By degrees it has come to pass that working men have been given over, isolated and defenseless, to the callousness of employers and the greed of unrestrained competition. . . . A small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the masses of the poor a yoke little better than slavery itself" (Leo XIII, "Rerum Novarum").

Forty years later the present head of the Catholic Church, Pius XI, said in comment on these words of his predecessor, "It is patent that in our day not alone is wealth accumulated, but immense power and despotic domination is concentrated in the hands of a few," with the result that these few grasp "as it were in their hands the very soul of production, so no one dare breathe against their will. . . . Free competition is dead; economic dictatorship has taken its place. . . . The whole economic life has become hard, cruel and relentless in a ghastly measure" (Pius XI, "Quadragesimo Anno").

You ask me why I say all this to you? I'll tell you: it is because I am seeking a revolution, and all revolutions have been led by youth. I am looking for a changed world, and I am counting upon you to help change it. I am looking for freedom, and you must push to one side those who would stand in the way. I will tell you later just what I mean; I am not talking in empty forms nor glittering generalities.

I entitled my address tonight, "In Defense of the Individual." Do not confuse my theme with a defense of the philosophy of that "Rugged Individualism" of which we have heard so much in recent years. "Rugged Individualism" meant the right of every man to overreach his neighbor. It was competition unregulated by any law higher than the law of the jungle, the law of tooth, claw and fang; conquer or perish. It was competition that knew little of legal restraint; that knew none of that restraint imposed by those higher laws of justice and charity by which it was meant that the relationships between a man and his fellows should be governed.

What was the result? We have already heard it in the words of two Popes. Leaders, thoughtful men of every race and religion under heaven, have said the same. "But," its defenders maintain, "'Rugged Individualism' is the American system and means freedom." But we deny that it is the American system and we know that it does not mean freedom. Is the farmer free when he cannot sell his products for enough to buy for himself and his family the necessities of life? Is the laborer free when he must accept, or starve, a wage with which he will still all but starve? Is the city dweller free who must live in wretched old-law tenements, while millions are spent to house the monkeys in the parks?

Is youth free, coming into a world that cries out to him, "Go back, go back; we do not want you because there is no place for you"? If that is freedom, then take me back to the days of Emperors and the Czars.

It is because it is not freedom and all the world knows that it is not that we have today's familiar phenomena: all across the world experiments in search of the better life. From one extreme to another the pendulum swings. We see governmental absolutism taking the reins, and in the name of efficiency and prosperity regulating every detail of human life. But who would buy efficiency and prosperity at the cost of freedom! Elsewhere, in the name of freedom even God has been dethroned and His authority denied. But to deny God is to enslave man. Escape from economic slavery via the tyranny of the dictator or of the masses is no escape at all. Any despotism is wrong and will fail because it does not properly take account of the individual, his dignity and his rights. The individual comes before the State and possess rights that even the State cannot take from him. As has well been said: "The function of the civil authority residing in the State is twofold: to protect and foster, but by no means to absorb the family and the individual, or to substitute itself for them" (Pope Pius XI, "Christian Education of Youth").

In other words, the function of the State is to provide such regulation of the relationships between man and man as will lead to the greatest good and happiness of all. These regulations should be as few as possible. They should be such as will on the one hand protect man from injustice on the part of his neighbor and on the other will aid him to secure a full life. They should interfere with his private and family life only "if within the walls of the household there occur grave disturbances of mutual rights" (Pope Leo XIII, "The Condition of Labor"). They must not, even under pretense of seeking the common good, infringe upon such inalienable personal liberties as the right of freedom of worship, of contracting monogamous and indissoluble marriage, of bringing forth and educating children, of the unhampered choice of vocation and pursuit of happiness, providing always of course that the rights of others are not invaded.

Let me make this very personal. It is easier to compre-

hend something that concerns you and me than to think in terms of the multitude. You are born, go to school, graduate, go out to face the world. Do you or do you not feel that you are individuals? That you are a person distinct and different from all other persons? Note that I said *distinct* and *different*. Those words are not synonymous. John Jones is numerically distinct from Jim Smith. But if John Jones and Jim Smith were inanimate toys, they might well be identical with each other in every respect, made from the same mold. But this is not the case when John Jones and Jim Smith are living human beings. They are not only distinct but are also different. You have never known any two people to be perfectly alike. Any two may resemble each other in some respects; we say sometimes that two people of our acquaintance are very much alike. But that is as far as it goes; there will always be far more points of divergence than of similarity. Man is not made on a mass-production basis, like prefabricated ships or houses. That is so whether you talk in terms of creation and the mind of a Creator or simply in terms of purely fortuitous combinations of chromosomes. Each is made separately and differently from any other. No two sets of blue prints are identical. Man is an individual.

Consider that in your own case. When I sat, as I did for four years, in the seats which you occupy tonight, the boy to the right of me had great musical talent. The one to the left of me was an athlete. I was neither. It is true of you. You have different aptitudes and want to do different things. And most of all, you want to be free to choose; ah, there is that blessed word *freedom* again! You do not want to be compelled by an all-powerful State to be a mechanic when you want to be an accountant, to make airplane parts when you would rather paint pictures, to raise wheat when you would like to study medicine. You do not want to be compelled by your neighbor to do any of these things. You do not want to be compelled to do or to be prevented from doing any of these things by economic necessity. You want to be free to choose, free to do what you will.

Of course, I know I do not have to say this, there is no such thing as absolute freedom. The freedom which we crave to do as we will, must always be conditioned by our neighbor's rights, because as we have rights, so has our

neighbor. We are not free to drive a car at a speed or in a way that might imperil others. We are not free to invade our neighbor's house because we might feel so inclined. We are not free to be offensive in word or deed to our neighbor. These are quite obvious and natural limitations to our freedom. Our rights, our freedom of choice, and our neighbor's rights and freedom of choice, taken together form the pattern of that most beautiful of all arts, the art of human living together. And the basic technique of that art, which each of us must master, is the unfailing recollection of the fact that each other human being is just as much an individual as ourselves, with hopes, aspirations, loves, desires, and a destiny; that all these things vary with each individual, and finally that the freedom to strive for these things is an inalienable right of each individual, as it is a right of our own, as long as neither he nor we in striving for the thing desired do not overstep the right of the other.

This is the true philosophy of individualism. It is not that individualism of which we spoke before that sees no limit to competition, no moral law in industry; whose only code is the survival of the fittest. To my way of thinking this philosophy springs from man's First Cause and Last End. I believe that each man is created by God, endowed with an immortal soul, and sent into the world with the obligation of living according to certain fixed standards of morality so that at the end of his life he may return to God to spend an eternity of perfect happiness with Him. I believe that Christ gave His life for man, and not only for all men collectively, but for each man individually. Therefore I believe that each man has an individual destiny with which no other man may interfere and which he himself is bound to pursue; a personality that is his own, and rights that no man may take from him. And you, whether you believe any or all of these fundamental things that are a part of my belief, at least you can say of every human being: "there is my brother man; I should have the same regard for him as I have for myself. I should do unto him as I would have him do unto me."

This is the revolution for which I am seeking. All tyranny is based on a lack of that due regard of which we have spoken for the inborn nobility and innate rights of the individual. It makes no difference, fundamentally, what

form despotism takes; it may be political, it may be economic; it may be that paradoxical and oftentimes most cruel despotism which results from the revolt against despotism. It is this last type that I fear most today. But whatever type it is, by reason of the very fact that it is despotism, it is a denial of that true philosophy of individualism of which we have spoken, and it springs, whatever the proximate and perhaps ostensibly noble motive may be, ultimately, fundamentally, from human selfishness. The revolution I am seeking is simply the universal recognition of and respect for the rights of others. Justice and charity must be the slogan of this revolution, justice and charity for all. There will be no peace in this world save through this revolution. We cannot legislate peace and happiness into a world the denizens of which still connive to overreach one another. No new social system nor economic philosophy nor industrial readjustment will bring the millennium to a world in which greed and lust for power still predominate. Man must see in man his brother, and must be just and kind to him before peace and happiness shall reign. Will not you, setting out to sow good seed into a world that needs it very badly, sow this seed? With the leaven of justice and charity let the world be leavened, and then for the first time the world shall see true freedom. Is not this a mission to fire your souls?

Modern Parents and the Child

MIRIAM A. LYNCH, A.B.

Broadcast given over Station WLWL, January 11, 1937, under auspices of the Alumnae Catholic Evidence Guild of New York.

MODERN parents—and not so modern parents—take a very human delight in comparing notes on their offspring. There is always some small triumph to win half-envious admiration, some childhood crisis met and conquered. Very often, the talk turns to serious discussions of common problems, arguments pro and con on some new point in the upbringing of the child.

A friend and I were talking about his young son. "Tom," he said, "isn't going to have things rammed down his throat. I want him to be free to think for himself. I'm not going to let some Sunday-school teacher give him a narrow, one-

sided notion of religion. He may make his own decisions when he grows up as to what he believes. When he's eighteen he can join any church he wants to. "I won't have him railroaded into my particular church." This reluctance on the part of a modern parent to intrude his beliefs on his child is a gesture many parents make in all sincerity, and as little logic. For this same friend of mine, you see, prides himself on his interest in young Tom's schooling, sees that he learns his lessons thoroughly each evening; shows off the boy's knowledge of the multiplication tables to his friends; tells him long stories of history; even taught him geography when the boy was just a tot. Tom, as a four-year-old, was most positive in his assertions that the earth was round, and there was his pretty, colored globe to prove it.

Would you say that my friend "rammed" this down the child's throat? Would you have had him let Tom decide for himself, at eighteen, whether he believed that the earth was flat—as was once thought—or that it was round, as has been discovered after years of experiment? Would you say he had imposed this belief on the child just because he, and his father before him, accepted it as true? Why did he not here, too, let the boy solve his own problems? The child would be an utter ignoramus to grow up not knowing this simple truth. He would be at a loss to take his place in civilized society. No sane father would consent to placing his son at such a disadvantage. The boy might, some day, through toilsome and costly investigation come upon this truth unaided. But he'd have wasted his time, fagged his brain "going off on tangents," until he finally hit upon the right answer. He'd have been shut off from the combined experience of mankind. The only sensible, the only efficient, thing to do is to tell him what all the world knows, and let him use his thinking to better advantage on problems yet to be solved. There are unanswered questions enough to keep him busy.

And this, in brief, is precisely why the Catholic Church teaches her children from babyhood the truths she has known throughout the centuries. She gives to her children the combined experience of mankind with his God, and, what is more, the guarantee of Christ Himself that that same experience will never deceive her.

The Church is not alone in setting up regulations con-

cerning the care of children. The law demands that they be supported physically and cared for medically. The State demands that the children be educated in fields to make them good citizens. And the Church requires that they be trained along religious and moral grounds. The Church insists on maintaining schools, where, from the primary grades right through to the highest university degree, the Catholic's education in his religion keeps pace with the growth of his mind along secular lines. The smallest Catholic school child learns, in an elementary way, the main points of Catholic faith and morals. As he grows older, he learns to "give a reason for the faith that is in him," and the more advanced his education becomes in science, mathematics, or languages, the more he learns of Catholic history, Catholic ethics, and Catholic philosophy. The Church thinks it incongruous that a man should be college bred in worldly knowledge, and know nothing about what his Church teaches, and so she offers a system where a man's religious training proceeds harmoniously and simultaneously with his training for the place in life he will some day fill.

This is the ideal Catholic education. Catholic parents are urged to take advantage of it, to give their children a "good start" in the spiritual order, as well as in things material. Yet if, for any reason, the Catholic parent is unwilling, or unable, to send his child to a Catholic school, the Church demands of him, as a matter of conscience, that he provide that child with at least a rudimentary schooling in his faith. She insists on a minimum of attendance by small children at some type of regular religious instruction, and parents must regard it a duty to see that their children comply. Along the same lines is her demand that all children of a mixed marriage, that is to say, a marriage between a Catholic and a non-Catholic, be educated in the Catholic Faith. My non-Catholic friends have often spoken to me of the "craftiness" of the Church in thus securing her power. "Of course," they say, "the Catholics are strong. They get them young, and, after children have these things dinned into their ears long enough, they're hooked for the rest of their lives. They never have a chance to know anything different."

It is true that the Church bends her most persistent efforts to the education of the young. She is too wise, she has seen too many generations, not to know that nothing

can be quite as important to spiritual life as this training of the young in religious belief. For this very reason do her most high-minded, unselfish, brilliant children flock to convents and seminaries to serve her thousands of parochial schools. It is also true that a real Catholic would as soon let his child grow up puzzling out the question "is the earth round or flat?" as let him grow up a spiritual illiterate, searching, an unhappy cynic, for something he feels a deep need of, yet something too much for an average mind to fathom, something that he would perhaps die without for want of time and mental stamina to determine for himself. Perhaps, if the more immediate needs of the physical world did not absorb him, he might come in time to a knowledge of this other life. Yet how wasted the years of groping, the weary searching, when he could so easily have been shown what he has had to seek. So the Catholic has his young child taught the simple truths of religion. It has still depths for him to probe and food for his thought if he be a philosopher. And, if the workaday world claims him in a struggle for daily necessities, he has a priceless solace in time of stress, a sure guide to his most torturing problems.

But to foist some one's "belief" upon a child, surely this is an imposition on his dependent status, quite different from showing him a fact. Then, it is the same effrontery to teach the child anything. You are accepting as a fact the history that is taught you, the mathematics that seems so obscure, the geography that is so foreign. How many of these things, these broad, general topics, can you prove first-hand from your experience? You *believe* them because wise men have discovered them. You accept the information they give you without question. Yet do these scientists demand less faith in their knowledge, in their integrity, than does the spiritual scientists, the Church that is guided and kept from error by an Intelligence greater than man's? You must believe every minute of your life. A true Catholic's "belief" has far more of certainty in it than has any popular acceptance of a half-baked scientific "proof" at its face value. He tells his child the truths of the spiritual order as simply and as confidently as you teach yours that the earth is round.

Forcing a belief upon a child seems not the sporting thing to a modern parent. Yet he does just that in every

lesson he requires the child to learn through his school years. It is the role of the mature to give to the immature the benefit of his experience and learning. This is the parent generation's debt to the new, and the universal law of nature. All animals teach their young to use the particular tools of the species. The human animal, too, must teach his young, and he must teach his entire being, his full, rounded being, of which the soul is the most important part. Just as an untaught child would be criminally handicapped in the world from which he must win grudging acceptance, so handicapped is the spiritually untaught in man's constant struggle toward a higher life. For, willy nilly, your son must have a certain minimum collection of facts as his daily tools; and, just as inescapably, he must use the tools of his soul if ever he is to gain so much as an hour of true peace and contentment in his life.

It has been the purpose of this talk to show you that the Catholic and his Church are not arrogant, are not high-handed, are not crafty, to demand that every child of Catholic parenthood be taught the knowledge the Church has guarded throughout the centuries. Every American child has as his birthright the opportunity and the duty to learn the common knowledge that is his ordinary equipment in his material life. Every Catholic child has, in addition, a birthright to a common knowledge, a knowledge that will be the key to a fuller, more peaceful life on earth, and his equipment for a life beyond the grave.

Progress of Catholic Missions in China

Reprinted from The Rock (Hong Kong), issue of February, 1937.

DURING the last statistical year,—July 1, 1935, to June 30, 1936, converts to the Catholic Faith in China, including Manchuria, reached the record figure of 106,316. The Catholic population at the end of the same period stood at 2,934,175 and, normally, should reach the three million mark by Easter of this year. This and much other interesting information concerning Catholic Missions in China is revealed in the *Annuaire-1937*. The *Annuaire* is a statisti-

cal booklet prepared by the Jesuit Bureau Sinologique in Shanghai from the yearly reports of the Superiors of the various mission areas. Converts are reckoned as the number of adults baptized in the course of the year after having given satisfactory evidence of both sincerity and sufficient instruction. For the first time in the history of China their annual total surpasses 100,000. The exact figure, 106,316, represents a ten per cent increase over the preceding year's results, which in their time constituted a record. The latest success is not, however, particularly surprising, for the last six years have indicated a decided upward trend:

1930-1	49,448	1933-4	82,145
1931-2	58,071	1934-5	96,680
1932-3	69,547	1935-6	106,316

Catechumens, or prospective converts, aggregate 526,673, a figure exceeding that of last year by over 31,000. The sum total of all registered baptisms for the year falls just short of 600,000. The exact number is 599,123, some 33,000 more than the year before. It includes, besides the official conversions just mentioned, the baptisms of 44,774 adults when mortally ill, 100,305 children of Catholics, and 347,728 other infants in danger of death from sickness or exposure. The census figure 2,934,175, reveals a net augmentation for the year 115,336, or slightly over four per cent. The augmentation of the year before was a little over three and one-half per cent.

This numerical increase of Catholics took place at a rate approximately six times that of the people as a whole. The proportion of Catholics to the general population (given by the *Annuaire* as 483,800,000) works out at just six-tenths of one per cent, in other words, one Catholic for every 165 persons. The actual density of the Catholic population in each of the Twenty Regions into which China is ecclesiastically divided varies widely. It is lowest in Kwangsi with but one Catholic to every thousand persons, and highest in Mongolia, where one out of every twenty-five persons is a Catholic. In the Hopeh Region, the average is one in forty. As regards the individual Vicariates or Mission areas, that of Peiping ranks highest with a proportion of one in fifteen. The Vicariate of Shanghai averages one in 143, and that of Canton one in 260.

The difference between the net augmentation (115,336) and conversions (106,316) may be accounted for by the preponderance of births over deaths and also to some extent by the fact that among those baptized in expectation of death and not officially counted as converts a number normally recover and take their place in the ranks of the Catholic population.

MISSIONARY PERSONNEL

The ranks of the priests, Religious Brothers and nuns have undergone respective augmentations of five and one-half, eight, and six per cent. Chinese constitute a fair majority of the missionary body: they account for two-fifths of the total of 4,452 priests, over half (55 per cent) of 1,263 Brothers, and nearly two-thirds (63 per cent) of 5,746 Sisters. There are thirteen Chinese Bishops and ten Chinese Prefects Apostolic. Of the total of 129 ecclesiastical areas (including Manchuria), the Chinese shoulder full responsibility for twenty-three, or one out of every six. As regards the splendid number, 3,626, of Chinese Catholic nuns, it seems noteworthy that seventy per cent of them belong to exclusively Chinese Congregations and that the remaining thirty per cent already constitute just one-third of the membership in China of the fifty Congregations transplanted from abroad.

That the forces of the Catholic missionary personnel, though not inconsiderable, are still far from adequate may be readily inferred from the fact that there is on the average but one priest to every 106,000 inhabitants. If one takes into consideration solely the Chinese clergy, the proportion is even more staggering: one priest for every 263,000 inhabitants. Of the total of 129 Mission areas, twenty-one are confided to the diocesan clergy, commonly called "secular" priests. The remaining 108 are assigned to some twenty-five Religious Orders or Congregations: the Franciscans Minor have twenty-four, the Paris Foreign Mission Society fourteen, the Lazarists or Vincentians thirteen, the Jesuits and the Society of the Divine Word seven each, the Scheut Fathers six (including stranded Urga, in Outer Mongolia), the Dominicans and the Milan Foreign Missions five each, the Maryknoll Society four, the Augustinians and the Capuchins three each, the Fathers of St. Columban and the

Parma Foreign Mission Society two each, and twelve other Congregations one each. In addition, nine Congregations, not officially charged with a Mission area, share their labors with others. Thirty-six distinct nationalities are represented among the personnel of Catholic Missions in China.

Major seminarists increased by forty-eight to a total of 983; minor seminarists, including probationers, advanced by sixty-five to 5,992. Lay catechists number 13,339, school teachers in the strict sense 15,202. Approximately forty per cent of each category are women. While the former have undergone a diminution of 478, the latter have increased by 605. This would seem to argue a widespread effort to place added emphasis on general education even at the cost of retrenchments in other important spheres of missionary activity. Including the so-called prayer-schools, there are 16,197 schools with a total enrollment of 435,522 pupils.

PROGRESS OF CHINA CATHOLIC MISSIONS

July 1, 1935, to June 30, 1936

		<i>NUMBER</i>	<i>Increase over Year Before</i>
Catholic Population		2,934,175	115,336
Conversions		106,316	9,636
Catechumens		526,673	31,613
Ecclesiastical Divisions		129	4
Entrusted to Foreign Clergy	106		3
Entrusted to Chinese Clergy	23		1
Priests		4,552	243
Foreign (including 81 Bishops)	2,717		155
Chinese (including 13 Bishops)	1,835		88
Brothers		1,263	96
Foreign	574		42
Chinese	689		54
Sisters		5,746	333
Foreign	2,120		125
Chinese	3,626		208
Seminarists		6,975	113
Major	983		48
Minor (including Probationers)	5,992		65
Catechists		13,339	-478
Men	7,986		-62
Women	5,353		-416
Baptisms		599,123	33,331
Adults	106,316		9,636
Children of Christians	100,305		7,835
Adults in danger of death	44,774		6,593
Infants in danger of death	347,728		9,267